

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

| APPLICATION NO | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/087,493 | 02/28/2002 | Michael C. Rushford | IL-10738 | 3025 |
| 7590 05/19/2004 | | | EXAMINER | |
| James S. Tak | | | CULBERT, ROBERTS P | |
| Assistant Laboratory Counsel Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| P.O. Box 808, L-703 | | | 1763 | |
| Livermore, CA | 94551 | | D. T. M. M. D. 05/10/000 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Alication No | Applicant(c) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| *4 | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | 10/087,493 | RUSHFORD, MICHAEL C. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Roberts Culbert | 1763 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute the period patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 A | <u>pril 2004</u> . | | | | | |
| | action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-65 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7,21,23 and 34-65 is 5) Claim(s) 18-20,22,24 and 25 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,8-10,15-17,26,27 and 31-33 is/are 7) Claim(s) 5, 6,11-14, 28 and 29 is/are objected 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance and application and acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptance are subjected to by the examine 10. | /are withdrawn from consideratione rejected. to. or election requirement. er. | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Setion is required if the drawing(s) is ob | ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | tion No ved in this National Stage | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other: | | | | | |

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Claims 1-6, 8-20, 22-29, and 31-33 in the response filed 4/23/04 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the apparatus cannot be used to practice another materially different process such as a non-parallel process. The argument is moot, however, because the apparatus can also be used to practice another materially different process such as a process that uses an etch solution having an etch rate that does not increase with temperature.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 15-17, 26, 27, and 31-33, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,904,340 to Miracky et al.

Referring to the figures and disclosure, Miracky teaches a method of figuring a substrate (58) surface comprising the steps of: contacting the substrate surface with an etchant solution (62), wherein an etch rate of the etchant solution increases with temperature (Fig 7); and generating a local thermal gradient in each of a plurality of selected local regions of a boundary layer of the etchant solution to imagewise etch the substrate surface in a parallel process. (Note that the limitation of generating a local thermal gradient in each of a plurality of selected local regions of a boundary layer of the etchant solution is inherent in the method of Miracky since Miracky heats a plurality of regions on the substrate, which are in direct contact with the etchant solution. It is clear from Fig 5, for example that the substrate is imagewise etched in a parallel process as broadly defined by applicant.

Art Unit: 1763

Miracky further teaches that the step of generating a local thermal gradient in each selected local region comprises locally heating each selected local region, whereby the selected local regions etch the substrate surface at higher etch rates than non-selected local regions and independently controlling the local heating of each selected local region to produce region-specific heating gradients in the boundary layer and thereby imagewise etch the substrate surface at region-specific etch rates as recited in clams 2 and 3.

Regarding Claims 4, 15-17,26 and 27, Miracky teaches that the local thermal gradient is generated by projecting electromagnetic radiation (laser) towards selected local regions of the boundary layer of the etchant solution and on a heatable material (substrate) in conductive contact with the boundary layer. (Col 1, Lines 13-20) Miracky further teaches that a computer processor is provided to independently control the local heating of each selected region. (Col 4, Lines 33-37)

Regarding Claims 8-10 and 31-33, Miracky teaches that the etchant solution is macro-cooled by fluid convention to a null etch rate whereby no etching takes place prior to the heating of the selected local regions. See Fig 2 and 3 and (Col. 4, Lines 43-68).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18-20 and 22-25 allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art of record fails to teach or render obvious a method of figuring a substrate surface comprising the steps of: contacting the substrate surface with an etchant solution, wherein an etch rate of the etchant solution increases with temperature; activating a plurality of selected heaters corresponding to a plurality of selected local regions of a boundary layer of the etchant solution, and chosen from an indexed array of heaters each for locally heating a corresponding local region of the boundary layer upon selective activation thereof; and independently controlling by a computer processor the activation of each selected heaters to produce region-specific heating gradients in the selected local regions of the boundary layer and thereby imagewise etch the substrate surface at region-specific etch rates in a parallel process.

Art Unit: 1763

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Claims 11-14, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to teach or render obvious a method of figuring a substrate surface comprising the steps of: contacting the substrate surface with an etchant solution, wherein an etch rate of the etchant solution increases with temperature; and generating a local thermal gradient in each of a plurality of selected local regions of a boundary layer of the etchant solution to imagewise etch the substrate surface in a parallel process, wherein the step of generating a local thermal gradient in each selected local region comprises locally heating each selected local region, whereby the selected local regions etch the substrate surface at higher etch rates than non- selected local regions wherein the step of locally heating each selected local region comprises activating a plurality of selected heaters corresponding to the selected local regions and chosen from an indexed array of heaters each locally heating a corresponding local region of the boundary layer upon selective activation thereof.

Claims 5, 6, 28 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to teach or render obvious a method of figuring a substrate surface comprising the steps of: contacting the substrate surface with an etchant solution, wherein an etch rate of the etchant solution increases with temperature; and generating a local thermal gradient in each of a plurality of selected local regions of a boundary layer of the etchant solution to imagewise etch the substrate surface in a parallel

Art Unit: 1763

process, wherein the step of generating a local thermal gradient in each selected local region comprises

locally heating each selected local region, whereby the selected local regions etch the substrate surface

at higher etch rates than non- selected local regions wherein a computer processor is provided to

independently control the local heating of each selected local region and further comprising the step of

interferometrically monitoring the substrate surface to deterministically control the computer processor

and the region-specific etch rates.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (571) 272-1433. The examiner can normally

be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Gregory Mills can be reached on (571) 272-1439. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

K. Callet

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

R. Culbert

CREGORY MILLS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Page 5